

### REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the application in view of the Office Action dated March 19, 2009 ("Office Action"). Claims 1, 27, 33, and 48 have been amended, and claims 82 and 84 have been cancelled. Claims 1-37, 48-75, 80, 81, and 83 are pending. For at least the reasons presented below, Applicants submit that Claims 1-37, 48-75, 80, 81, and 83 are allowable over the Office Action's rejections. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### Telephone Interview

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on June 9, 2009. During the interview, the Examiner clarified his rejection of the present claims. No agreement was reached.

#### Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-37, 48-75 and 80-84 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,507,278 to Brunetti et al. ("*Brunetti*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,471,039 to Bruun et al. ("*Bruun*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and all assertions and holdings therein because it has not been shown that *Brunetti* and *Bruun*, whether individually or in combination, teach, suggest, or disclose each and every element of the present amended claims.

Amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the *Brunetti-Bruun* combination at least because the proposed combination has not been shown to disclose a baggage scanner and a tray slide, wherein a portion of the tray slide in the sterile area is adjacent to a portion of the baggage scanner in the sterile area, and the tray slide and the baggage scanner form a substantially continuous path operable to deliver a tray from the sterile area to a screening subject in the non-sterile area, as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action cites two standard, identical conveyor belts used in airport screening systems in *Burnetti* as representing the baggage scanner unit and the tray slide unit recited in the present claims. *See* Office Action at page 2; *Brunetti* at

Fig. 2 (element 24). The baggage scanner and the tray slide of the present disclosure, however, are not the same as two standard, identical conveyor belts used for airport security. First, the tray slide recited in the present claims includes at least a portion in the sterile area that is adjacent to a portion of the baggage scanner in the sterile area. The conveyors in *Brunetti*, however, are not adjacent to each other, and a portion of one conveyor in the sterile area is not adjacent to a portion of the other conveyor in the sterile area as recited in example claim 1. Second, the baggage scanner and tray slide of the present disclosure form a substantially continuous path operable to deliver a tray from the sterile area to a screening subject in the non-sterile area as recited in claim 1. The conveyors in *Brunetti*, however, have not been shown to disclose this feature. Instead, as seen in Fig. 2 of *Brunetti*, each conveyor in *Brunetti* is a conventional, stand-alone security scanning unit used in a typical airport security setting, and the conveyors of *Brunetti* fail to form a substantially continuous path as recited in claim 1. See *Brunetti* at Fig. 2 (element 24). *Bruun* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Brunetti* because it also fails to disclose a baggage scanner and a tray slide, wherein a portion of the tray slide in the sterile area is adjacent to a portion of the baggage scanner in the sterile area, and the tray slide and the baggage scanner form a substantially continuous path operable to deliver a tray from the sterile area to a screening subject in the non-sterile area, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom. Independent claims 27 and 48 include certain aspects analogous to claim 1. For similar reasons as above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 27, 48, and all claims depending therefrom.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Applicants believe that no fees are due. However, if this is incorrect, please charge such fees or credit any overpayments to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 19, 2009

/Spencer C. Patterson/

Spencer C. Patterson

Reg. No. 43,849

**PTO Customer No. 26231**

Fish & Richardson P.C.

1717 Main Street

Suite 5000

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: (214) 747-5070

Facsimile: (214) 747-2091